

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 5 through 11, 16 through 20, 25 through 29 remain pending. Claims 1, 10, 11, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 25 are hereby amended. Support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification, particularly Figures 2, 3, 8 through 11, 13 through 16, 18 through 21, and 23. No new matter has been added. Claims 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 15, 21, 22, 23, 24, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 are hereby canceled.

Claims 1 through 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,392,640 (issued May 21, 2002) to Will, of record, [hereinafter “Will”] in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,310,634 (issued Oct. 30, 2001) to Bodnar et al, of record, [hereinafter “Bodnar”].

Independent claims 1 and 25 have been amended to provide the features of adding a most probable completion alternative to a content string entry line of the display, and adding a second completion alternative for a second input, where the second completion alternative is either a most probable combination of the most probable first character selected from a first set of textual characters and a most probable second character selected from a second set of textual characters, or a most probable second sub-string, where the second sub-string begins with a most probable first character and a most probable second character and includes at least a most probable third character.

In contrast, *Will* does not teach determining a most probable completion alternative using a personalized and learning database, as stated in the Office Action of September 11, 2006. The Office Action asserts that *Bodnar* teaches this limitation of the independent claims, but *Bodnar* does not describe or suggest adding a most probable completion alternative to a content string entry line of the display, and adding a second completion alternative for a second input, where the second completion alternative is either a most probable combination of the most probable first character selected from a first set of textual characters and a most probable second character selected from a second set of textual characters, or a most probable second sub-string, where the second sub-string begins with a most probable first character and a most probable second character and includes at least a most probable third character, as required by claims 1 and 25 as

amended. Therefore, *Will* and *Bodnar*, whether individually or on combination, do not describe or suggest the above limitation of independent claims 1 and 25 as amended.

Independent claims 1 and 25 further distinguish from *Will* and *Bodnar*. In particular, claims 1 and 25 as amended recite key selection inputs. In contrast, *Will* describes a system requiring various separate or multiple menus, distinct from the content string entry line of the display. See Will, FIG. 1A, 1B, 1C, 5, 6A, 6B, 7A, 7B, 8A, 8B, etc. *Will* discloses a system where a user must move a cursor to a separate word selection menu to select a word to be entered into a content string entry line. See Will, col. 2, lines 42-51. *Will* teaches away from claims 1 and 25 in that “a miniature keyboard such as could be embodied in such a small device would be tedious and slow to use, and not necessarily better than the present device.” See Will, col. 6, lines 9-15. Likewise, *Bodnar* does not describe or suggest any type of key selection inputs, as required by claims 1 and 25 as amended.

Claims 5 through 11 and 16 through 20 depend from and include all limitations of, independent claim 1 as amended. Similarly, claims 26 through 29 depend from, and include all limitations of, independent claim 25 as amended. Therefore, claims 5 through 11 and 16 through 20 patentably distinguish from *Will*, *Bodnar*, and the suggested combination of these references for the reasoning provided above for claim 1 and claim 25.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 5 through 11, 16 through 20, 25 through 29 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Heiko K. Sacher, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

/HISASHI D. WATANABE/ 04/08/2008
Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350